

REMARKS

Claims 15-42 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 15, 20, 28, 29, 34 and 42 are amended. Support for the amendments can at least be found in Figures 9 and 10 and page 22, line 15 to page 26, line 6 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18, 20-23, 29-32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,877,777 to Colwell in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,819 to Gagne et al. (Gagne) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,634,948 to Hayashi et al. (Hayashi); claims 19, 26, 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Colwell in view of Gagne in view of Hayashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,861 to Deering et al. (Deering); and claims 24, 25, 27, 38, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Colwell in view of Gagne in view of Hayashi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,854 to Isowaki et al. (Isowaki). The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that Colwell, Gagne, Hayashi, Deering and Isowaki, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 15, 20, 29 and 34 including, *inter alia*, determining at least one surface-specifying point that is to be moved...from among surface-specifying points that are

distributed, after the object has been subjected to an initial impact, but no subsequent impacts, over the surface of the object or in a vicinity of the object for defining the primitive surface that forms the object. Applicants submit that the subject matter recited in each of claims 15, 20, 29 and 34 are advantageous at least because the image generation load before an object has been subjected to an initial impact can be reduced by generating a surface-specifying point when an object is subjected to an initial impact. Further, claims 15, 20, 29 and 34 recite subject matter that allows an image that is undergoing distortion to be generated, by moving the surface-specifying point(s).

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Colwell, Gagne, Hayashi, Derring and Isowaki, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 15, 20, 29 and 34, as well as all the features of claims 16-19, 21-27, 30-33, and 35-41, which depend therefrom. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Isowaki in view of Colwell and further in view of Hayashi. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants submit that Isowaki, Colwell or Hayashi, alone or in combination, fail to disclose all the features recited in independent claims 28 and 42 at least because they fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, storing information on the object formed by the polygonal surface having vertices that are a plurality of points distributed, after the object has been subjected to an initial impact, but no subsequent impacts, over the surface of the object at a predetermined density, as recited in amended claims 28 and 42.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that the subject matter recited in each of claims 28 and 42 is advantageous at least because the image generation load before an object has been subjected to an initial impact can be reduced by generating a surface-specifying


point when an object is subjected to an initial impact. Further, claims 28 and 42 recite subject matter that allows an image that is undergoing distortion to be generated, by moving the surface-specifying point(s).¹

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Isowaki, Colwell and Hayashi fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 28 and 42. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs
Date: April 26, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
